

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13, 15 and 19-22 are pending in this application. By this Supplemental Amendment, claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiners Raizen and Schwartz at the interview held February 17, 2004 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

The attached replacement drawing sheet incorporates changes to Fig. 25 only to correct an incorrect label in the drawing sheet filed on December 3, 2003. Applicant respectfully requests approval of the attached replacement sheet to Fig. 25.

The Office Action rejects claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Hagiwara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,232) (Hagiwara); claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Shirayanagi (U.S. Patent No. 6,419,549); claims 1-2 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hagiwara in view of Guirao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,511,180) (Guirao); claims 1, 3, 15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hagiwara in view of Kitani (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,615) and claims 7, 9 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hagiwara in view of Kitani and further in view of Kato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,983 B1) (Kato). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant reiterates that the cancellation of claims 14 and 16 renders their rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 14 and 16 be withdrawn.

As discussed during the personal interview, Shirayanagi does not disclose or suggest a spectacle lens supply method wherein at least one optical performance of the left and right lenses, which is selected among astigmatism, curvature of field, and distortion, is similar, as

recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims over Shirayanagi be withdrawn.

Moreover, neither Hagiwara, Guirao, or Kitani either alone or in combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious a spectacle lens supply method wherein the base curves of the left and right convex surface sides approximate each other and at least one optical performance of the left and right lenses, which is selected among astigmatism, curvature of field, and distortion, is similar, when the difference in prescription between the left and right eyes is over a specific amount, as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims over Hagiwara, Guirao, and Kitani be withdrawn.

Furthermore, neither Hagiwara nor Kitani, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a method for manufacturing a spectacle lens wherein a design is performed so that the left and right spectacle lenses satisfy their respective prescription conditions including the diopter so that the difference in the curvature of the first refractive surfaces between the left and right spectacle lenses falls within a range of 1D or less, as recited in independent claim 15. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 and its dependent claims over Hagiwara and Kitani be withdrawn.

Finally, neither Hagiwara, Kitani or Kato, either alone or in combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious a spectacle lens supply system wherein a manufacturer's side computer has the function of performing lens design such that a customer experiences substantially no discomfort when the difference in prescription between the left and right eyes is over a specific amount, as recited in independent claim 7. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 7 and its dependent claims over Hagiwara, Kitani and Kato be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-2, 4-11, 13, 15 and 19-22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Tarik M. Nabi  
Registration No. 55,478

JAO:TMN/dmw

Attachment:  
Replacement Sheet

Date: February 27, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---